

Quarterly Progress Report Extended Year 1

Submit Quarterly Reports by email to: sschoenig@cdfa.ca.gov
DUE by August 1st, October 1st, 2002 and January 15th 2003

Weed Management Area: Yolo County
Person(s) writing this progress report: Jenny Drewitz
Contract Number: 00-0581

Funds Provided: \$30,149.00
Total Funds spent to date: \$30,042.42

% Contract Complete (your best approximation): 99%

I. Narrative

[verbal description of success in implementation of projects; be candid; how is it going?

8 sentence MAX]

This report touches on the last bit of work conducted to complete the year 1 projects. The cost share program took a lot of time to coordinate with all the landowners and to collect good site-specific information for each of their weed problems. If conducted in the future, this type of project should be allocated more funding for staff time. The revegetation sites require continuous maintenance while the native grasses are still becoming established. We will continue to allocate resources to these project sites.

II. Control Project Tasks Initiated or Completed

[Include: (1) acres and/or number of sites treated; (2) In-kind dollars; (3) In-kind hours; (4) Methods to be used to evaluate or measure treatment success; (5) monitoring data, if available.]

1. Davis Bike Path. With all tasks completed, all that remained to be done was some maintenance of the revegetation site and some follow-up monitoring. Maintenance activities included mowing/weed whacking for approximately 10hrs on separate occasions with 1 hr in-kind by the Ag. office equaling approximately \$20.

Davis Bike Path Revegetation site.



Monitoring data: Two sections of the Davis Bike Path are undergoing control for yellow starthistle and puncturevine. One section was revegetated with native perennial grasses in Fall 2001. The other section was not revegetated. Below you will see monitoring data for each site.

% cover of yellow starthistle		
Treatment (reveg with native grass)	Treatment (no reveg)	Control*
0	4.2	17

* Controls were established for each treatment site at the time of monitoring by traveling to an adjacent site that did not undergo treatment. Starred (*) controls actually are baseline data that was collected on the treatment site prior to treatment implementation.

2. I-505 project. Task 4 of this project, spray adjacent properties, was completed by applying Transline herbicide at 4oz/acre on approximately 60 acres just north of the revegetation site at the intersection of I-505 and CR 14. The application was made by helicopter. A Transline application was made to the revegetation site (general maintenance) as the fall burn seemed to stimulate additional starthistle seed germination post native grass planting. Three in-kind hours were spent (\$60) by the Ag. office training the RCD on use of the WMA sprayer for use on the revegetation site. Follow up monitoring data is included from three different locations associated with this project:

1. The interstate
2. The revegetation demonstration site
3. The adjacent private land

% cover of yellow starthistle					
Interstate		Revegetation		Private land	
Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control**	Treatment	Control
25	35	0	42	0	42

** Same control used for both revegetation and private land.

I-505 revegetation site.



The revegetation site has been used as a training site by the California Native Grass Association for training CalTrans employees on using native perennial grasses in roadside revegetation. More detailed information on site available upon request.

Task 5 of this project has not been implemented due to the presence of biological control agents already on the site.

3. Private landowner/agency project. Nine different landowners participated in this project. A project description including acreage, target species, treatment, and monitoring information is included. Photos are available for all locations but only a select few will be included in the report. Additional photos can be made available upon request. Approximately 24 in-kind hours were spent (worth about \$480) by landowners corresponding with the WMA on their projects. Individual folders were established for each landowner including:

1. A letter of application that was submitted by the landowner to the WMA asking for funding including details of the weed problem, location, and ideas for treatment.
2. Photos and/or maps of the site
3. Copies of invoices from vendors utilized by landowner
4. Copies of invoices that were submitted to the WMA for reimbursement
5. Copies of tax forms required for reimbursement
6. Notes and correspondences collected over time from interactions between the WMA and the landowner.

Summary of cost share projects.

No.	Target species	Acreage	Treatment	WMA \$\$ funded
1	Perennial pepperweed	0.25	Grazing and Round up	Chemical
2	Johnsongrass and Yellow starthistle	1	2,4-D and Round up	Chemical
3	Yellow starthistle and Tamarisk	10	Transline and Round up	Chemical
4	Yellow starthistle	20	Grazing	Electric fencing
5	Yellow starthistle	22	Various herbicides	Chemical
6	Medusahead, Goatgrass, and Yellow starthistle	37	Hand removal and Round up	Labor
7	Yellow starthistle and Russian thistle	4	Round up and Goal	Chemical
8	Yellow starthistle and various other weeds.	1.5	Touchdown and Goal	Chemical
9	Tamarisk	2	Stalker and Round up	Chemical



Project 7 before.



Project 7 after.

4. Monitoring methods. For each project, for approximately every 2 acres of land, 3 random samples of vegetation cover were taken. A 1 m² sampling frame was used for each sample. A sample data sheet is attached. Photo points at the treatment location were GPS'd and marked with a short stake. Photographs were taken at both the treatment and control sites.

5. Weed Warrior. The Weed Warrior continued to work 1-2 days per week on WMA projects from September-December 2001. This time (approximately 170 hrs or \$3400) exceeded the WMA funding for this position and was an in-kind contribution from the Yolo County RCD.

III. Mapping Project Tasks Initiated or Completed

[Include: (1) Equipment and/or type maps used; (2) acres and/or number of sites mapped; (3) In-kind dollars; (4) In-kind hours]

No information to report.

IV. Education Project Tasks Initiated or Completed

[Include: (1) Number of people reached; (2) In-kind dollars; (3) In-kind hours]

No information to report.

V. Problems and Delays Encountered by Project/Task:

All of the cost share projects have been implemented except for the Tamarisk control in project No. 3 and 9. Implementation for these projects will occur late summer/early fall 2002 to ensure highest degree of efficacy.

VI. Other Issues or Comments:

Sample data sheet.

Project:

Date:

Site location:

Recorder:

Goal: to obtain percent vegetative cover at sites where WMA has conducted weed control work (totaling 100%).

Focus: target weed species and native perennial grasses if planted/present

Instructions: 3 reps every 2 acres

	% Cover								
	Treatment			Treatment			Control		
	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5	Rep 6	Rep 7	Rep 8	Rep 9
Starthistle (live)									
Dead YST									
Native grass									
Dead vegetation									
Other vegetation									
Bare Ground									
Thatch									

	northing	easting
GPS position		

Notes:

location of stake?

photo log?
